

project director Mary Jo Lynch to develop a questionnaire. It is hoped the study will yield a document to parallel "Non-tax Sources of Revenue for Public Libraries," which was released earlier this year as a result of an earlier Wilson-funded project.

Liaison efforts included visits by President Bill Moffett to the meetings of EDUCOM in Ann Arbor and the Association of Research Libraries in Washington, D.C., as well as by Moffett and Segal to the Oberlin Group meeting at the Claremont, Whittier, and Occidental campuses in Southern California.

Financial reports for the year ended August 31, 1989, showed higher revenues than budgeted (mostly due to the Cincinnati Conference success) and an excess revenue for the year of \$149,000. This brings the fund balance back above its basic

level, as frequently happens in the year of the national conference. Although a deficit is projected in the 1990 operating budget, it is expected that this "cushion" will allow us to end the year with the fund balance at the level mandated (50% of average annual expenses). Membership was up by 6.3% to 10,739 (9,587 personal and 1,152 organizational members).

President-elect candidates Anne Beaubien and Maxine Reneker visited headquarters October 6 to meet the staff and be briefed on association affairs. Other visitors included Mike Kathman, Planning Committee chair. Pat Swanson, Professional Education Committee chair, hosted a visit from Segal in nearby Hyde Park.—*JoAn S. Segal, ACRL Executive Director.*



Middle States Association makes a commitment to BI

At a recent meeting for chairs of evaluation teams and for librarians serving as site visitors, Howard Simmons, executive director of the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, made a strongly-stated commitment to assuring diversity and highlighting the role of libraries through the accreditation process.

The meeting, held on September 14, 1989, in Philadelphia, opened with a general session involving the two groups who were convening that day: chairs of evaluation teams and library directors, plus the Commission on Higher Education of Middle States. Simmons set the tone for the meeting by indicating his serious intent to pursue certain new directions, including diversity and library user education. He defined diversity as extending to staffing, faculty, curriculum, and students and gave examples of what he considered evidence of diversity. He cited the MSA Commission on Higher Education and staff itself as one such example, then introduced senior staff members for presentations on their programs.

Emphasis is being placed on such matters as the "teaching/learning environment"—consideration of the total institutional impact on student learning, including off-campus facilities, libraries, faculty attitudes, and other signs that this is a dynamic, interactive process. Outcomes assessment was addressed; although underlining the principle that each institution is unique and must derive its own measures, both qualitative and quantitative, he pledged MSA's commitment to such assessment and expressed a concern that, if the institutions do not dedicate themselves to the task, someone else

will impose less acceptable criteria. Need for planning was also highlighted.

Diversity and equity were defined in an expanded fashion. One feature is a curriculum that encompasses the nontraditional and non-Western cultures and works by women. Another is the creation of a comfortable environment, where all community members have the opportunity to express themselves and to find a group of people with whom they can identify or among whom they can find role models, is of high value. Tools such as exhibits and special events were mentioned that raise consciousness and develop respect for women and minorities.

This was a very exciting environment; a no-nonsense commitment to diversity and equity was clearly broadcast. Equally exciting for librarians was Simmons' stand on bibliographic instruction. He announced that the revised *Characteristics of Excellence*, which constitute the criteria for accreditation, includes the statement that a program of bibliographic instruction is mandatory and that he is dedicated to enforcing this requirement. Simmons' familiarity with libraries reflects his student library assistant days; his description of how he unlocked the mystery of how to use the library and shared his knowledge with others was significant. His awareness of the problem that faculty members do not themselves use or understand libraries was manifest; he urged the librarians to infiltrate the faculty; and to use their participation on accrediting teams to go outside the library to talk to faculty and students about their library and its services, to examine syllabi, course outlines, samples of student work, and curriculum planning

processes for evidence of library involvement in the teaching/learning process.

The groups then divided; there were two sessions for the library directors. In one session, Stanton Biddle, Baruch College, described the ACRL University Library Standards for the participants. These standards, plus those for college libraries and two-year institutions and information about the Output Measures Manual, were included in the packets distributed. He stressed the change in emphasis from quantitative to qualitative standards and the need to focus on the meaning of numbers, rather than see them as an absolute. All data must be reconciled with the mission, goals and objectives. He emphasized that the purpose of the site visit is to verify the accuracy of the self-study and to

gain a better understanding of the environment.

In the other session, Marilyn Lutzker, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, offered an approach for evaluators as they consider bibliographic instruction programs in their site visits. She suggested they look at the school and weigh the effect of the program on the overall institution. She suggested four methods to use in the evaluation: the self-study, the library's statement of objectives, the examination of syllabi and course outlines, and discussions with faculty, administrators, and students. Lutzker will prepare an article for *C&RL News* on this topic in the near future.

Simmons has also accepted an invitation for the Commission to be a member of the ALA-sponsored National Forum on Information Literacy. ■ ■

Educational roles for academic libraries

Prepared by the BIS Think Tank

*Betsy Baker (chair), Beth Sandore,
Mary Ellen Larson, Randy Hensley*

The ACRL/BIS Think Tank defines the state-of-the-art and prepares an agenda for the future.

The Bibliographic Instruction Section sponsored its first Think Tank in 1981. A group of six recognized leaders in the area of bibliographic instruction was identified by a BIS planning committee. This early Think Tank of 1981 was charged with several responsibilities: 1) identifying the key issues shaping the future of BI; 2) recommending a program of research and action to enable the profession to overcome obstacles and seize opportunities related to BI; 3) stimulating professional discourse. The results of these deliberations outlined an agenda for the 1980s that

significantly advanced BI and has served as a focus for much BIS effort over the past decade. The reader is referred to "Think Tank Recommendations for Bibliographic Instruction," *College & Research Libraries News* 42 (1981): 396, for further review of the 1981 Think Tank.

Much of the progress in the educational efforts of academic libraries in recent years can be traced to that first Think Tank. Yet, the changes affecting libraries and their institutional constituencies have been equally profound. The ensuing decade since the first Think Tank has seen the widespread move